

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/059,180	EGELUND ET AL.
	Examiner Phong H Nguyen	Art Unit 3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Phong H Nguyen.

(3) Mr. James Wray.

(2) Mr. Allan Shoap.

(4) Mr. Matthew Laskoski

Date of Interview: 06 June 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: That applied in the rejections

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

It was suggested that the claims need additional structure such as the variable width and a specific utensil device at one end of the handle.

Claim 1 is sufficiently broad, for example, it is reading on a U-shaped molding or a V-shaped ruler.

ally

Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required